



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,333	12/11/2001	Kenji Aoki	0671.66008	1506
24978	7590 01/18/2005		EXAMINER	
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN			MILLER, BRIAN E	
300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2652	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/014,333	AOKI, KENJI				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Brian E. Miller	2652				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 22 November 2004 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment				
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: 3,4 and 6-10.						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1, 5, 11, 12, 14-15</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:		25 mll				
	0//	Drien E Miller				

Brian E. Miller Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2652 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are not persuasive and the FINAL rejection is still deemed appropriate. It is noted that claims 3-4 and 6-10 have been objected to and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitation of the base claim(s) and any intermediate claims.